

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 312 882

FL 018 200

AUTHOR Seda, Ileana; Abramson, Shareen
TITLE English Writing Development of Young, Linguistically
Different Learners.
PUB DATE 89
NOTE 21p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; *Individual Differences; *Journal
Writing; *Kindergarten; *Limited English Speaking;
Primary Education; Second Language Learning; *Skill
Development; *Writing Skills

ABSTRACT

A study examined the emergence of English writing in a kindergarten classroom where about three-quarters of the students were limited-English-proficient (LEP) and spoke a variety of native languages, including Spanish, Hmong, Lao, and Cambodian. Regular daily journal writing sessions were videotaped periodically and analyzed over the course of the year. Three case studies illustrating the variety of performances in the classroom are used to present the results. Results indicate that young, linguistically different learners learning a written language for the first time demonstrate stages of writing development similar to those found in native speakers of the language. The study suggests that the relationship between oral and written language is not only transactional, but also that learners need not be proficient speakers of a second language to benefit from oral and written transactions in that language. It is also suggested that childrens's individual differences in ability, personality, and style influence literacy learning in a second language. Instructional implications for LEP children in a regular classroom are discussed. (Author/MSE)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED312882

Ileana Seda
Division of Curriculum &
Instruction
The Pennsylvania State University
253 Chambers Building
University Park, PA 16802
814-865-2161

Shareen Abramson
School of Education and Human
Development
California State University-Fresno

ENGLISH WRITING DEVELOPMENT OF YOUNG,
LINGUISTICALLY DIFFERENT LEARNERS

Running Head: LINGUISTICALLY DIFFERENT LEARNERS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

I. Seda

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ENGLISH WRITING DEVELOPMENT OF YOUNG, LINGUISTICALLY DIFFERENT LEARNERS

Abstract

A growing body of research of young children's writing development has highlighted the transactional nature of oral and written language in the emergence of literacy. While writing before reading is generally viewed as an important component in literacy development for pre-school and kindergarten children, little is known about the effectiveness of English as a first written language for writing instruction of limited English proficient (LEP) young children. The present study was designed to examine the emergence of English writing in a kindergarten classroom where 21 of the 28 to 31 children enrolled during the year were LEP and spoke a variety of languages (Spanish, Hmong, Lao, and Cambodian). Regular daily journal writing sessions were videotaped periodically and analyzed over the course of the year. Three case studies illustrating the variety of performances in the classroom are used to present the results. Results indicate that young linguistically different learners who are learning a written language for the first time demonstrate stages of writing development similar to those found in native speakers of the language. The study suggests that the relationship between oral and written language is not only transactional but also that learners need not be proficient speakers of a second language to benefit from oral and written transactions in that language. It also suggests that individual differences in ability, personality and style on the part of the children influences literacy learning in a second language. Instructional implications for LEP children in a regular classroom are discussed.

ENGLISH WRITING DEVELOPMENT OF YOUNG, LINGUISTICALLY DIFFERENT LEARNERS

Background

Linguistically different children represent a growing segment of the United States and the rest of the world's school-age population. While assistance may be available from English as a Second Language (ESL) or bilingual programs in the United States, the primary responsibility for teaching English literacy skills (speaking, listening, reading, and writing) to most limited-English proficient (LEP) students now rests with the regular classroom teacher (Enright & McClosky, 1985). While there is a critical need for more research, few studies have examined instruction of LEP students in the regular classroom. For example, while writing instruction has been the focus of much recent classroom research (e.g., Calkins, 1983; Clark, 1988; DiPardo, & Freeman, 1988; Graves, 1983) only a limited number of studies involving LEP students have been conducted, mainly in special programs designed for LEP students (Edelsky, 1986; Urzua, 1987; Peyton, 1986).

Edelsky (1986), Urzua (1987) and Peyton (1986) found that writing, in the form of stories or dialogue journals, was instructionally effective for developing English literacy in LEP students. Edelsky observed that second and third grade children in a bilingual program wrote stories in English that contained invented spellings similar to those of native English-speaking children. Based on her review of existing studies, Hudelson (1984) concluded that some LEP students become aware of English print and can write in English before attaining oral language fluency. She also found that writing enhances oral language development and reading comprehension. All of the aforementioned studies dealt with elementary school students already receiving formal instruction in reading and writing. No studies were found that looked at English writing

development of LEP young children with little or no previous exposure to schooling.

Research on young children's writing development prior to receiving formal instruction in school has highlighted the transactional nature of oral and written language in the emergence of literacy (Beers, 1980; Bissex, 1980; Chomsky, 1971; Clay, 1976; Dyson, 1985, 1986; Ferreiro & Teberosky, 1982; Goodman, 1986; Henderson, 1981; Harste, Woodward, & Burke, 1984; Read, 1971; Sulzby, 1985, 1986; Templeton, 1986). These researchers generally agree that children's writing development reflects children's growing awareness of the relationship between oral and written language and knowledge about print.

While several of these researchers proposed stages of writing development as indicated by children's use of invented spelling strategies (Beer, 1980; Bissex, 1980; Henderson, 1981), Ferreiro and Teberosky, in a study of Spanish-speaking four, five and six-year olds in Argentina, identified the earliest stages of writing development when children make the transition from scribbling to writing. Kamii, Long, Manning and Manning (1986) attempted to replicate part of the Ferreiro and Teberosky study with English-speaking children. In general, their data supported stages suggested by Ferreiro and Teberosky, awareness of syllables and vowels occurred at the third stage of the developmental sequence whereas Kamii et al. found consonantal awareness to occur at this stage. Kamii et al. attributed this variation to differences between grapheme-sound correspondences in Spanish and English. Kamii et al. described four developmental levels for English writing as follows: Level 1--Letter Strings; Level 2--Fixed Quantity of Letters to Represent Words; Level 3--Consonantal Writing; Level 4--Approaching Conventional Spelling.

As more research in early writing accumulates, educators have been recommending writing activities for preschool and kindergarten programs

(Coate & Castle, 1989; Graves, 1986; Hipple, 1983; Hoffman & Knipping, 1988). However, little is known about the effectiveness of English as a first written language for writing instruction of LEP young children.

With a substantial body of literature in emergent writing in first language as a base, the present study was designed to examine the emergence of English writing, in LEP kindergarten children. The study was conducted in a regular kindergarten classroom in an attempt to make sense of children's learning of English print conventions and of the context in which it occurs (Deford, 1986; Goodman, 1978). Of special interest was to observe the stages of English writing development displayed by children learning English as a second language and as a first written language and how those compared to native English speakers.

An important assumption of this research was that writing as a form of language learning is mediated by social interactions between teacher and learner and among peers (Amato, 1988; Rogoff, 1986; Vygotsky, 1978). Rogoff calls this type of instruction "guided participation" and states that it a) provides a bridge between familiar skills and those needed to solve a new problem, b) offers a structure for problem-solving and c) involves active engagement by the child and adult. Journal writing was selected in this study because, in the particular classroom observed, it incorporated elements of guided participation, and offered a setting in which English literacy skills were the main instructional focus. Children who participated in the study were exposed to instruction in writing for the first time. The mediating language was English for all children in the classroom.

METHOD

Subjects and Context

The study was conducted in an urban kindergarten classroom in central California. The particular school serves a multi-ethnic, multi-lingual, lower socio-economic community. In an attempt to meet the needs of its diverse student population, the entire school has adopted a "whole language approach" as its instructional program. Evidence of this approach includes use of experiential learning techniques, literature-based rather than basal reading program, thematic teaching to integrate curriculum areas, and an emphasis on writing. In addition, teachers receive intensive in-service training on second language development and on cultural diversity.

The kindergarten class observed consisted of 28 to 31 children enrolled over the course of the year. Ten of these children were proficient speakers of English; the other 21 had varied language backgrounds including Spanish, Hmong, Lao and Cambodian.

During daily journal writing time, small groups of five to six children were called to work with the teacher at the writing table. The groups were heterogeneous in respect to ability and language and the individual children in each group changed weekly. Children were encouraged to write or draw in their journals on topics of their choice. When children had completed their work, the teacher asked each of them to "read" their story and she discussed each story orally with them. Often, she would also respond by writing a question in the child's presence, while stating it out loud. Children were then asked to "write" back their answer. The teacher offered help in their writing efforts by prompting letter-sound associations, reminding them of stories read, of charts, of other written information in the room environment which they could consult, or by asking them to help one another. Frequently children were observed to

verbally interact with their peers in their first language, when they had a common first language. These verbal interactions mainly dealt with the journal writing task such as telling their story, producing the sounds of the letters to write, or finding a word in a book or chart.

Procedure

The study followed a naturalistic research methodology. The researchers observed the writing events in the classroom as they had been designed by the teacher. The daily journal writing sessions were videotaped by the researchers approximately twice per month from October through June. English proficiency performance scores or the Bilingual Syntax Measure (BSM) were provided by the teacher for each individual child. Other performance data made available by the teacher were Language Experience Stories, Letter Recognition Inventory scores, and copies of each child's year-long journals. In analyzing journal writing samples, Kamii's et al. (1986) classification scheme of the stages of invented spelling was used. Recall that these stages are described by Kamii as follows: Level 1--Letter Strings; Level 2--Fixed Quantity of Letters to Represent Words; Level 3--Consonantal Writing; Level 4--Approaching Conventional Spelling.

RESULTS

In order to present the results of the study three representative case studies of the linguistically different learners in the classroom will be used. The illustrative cases present distinctive developmental patterns in English writing acquisition. For each case, the progression of literacy development as demonstrated by their journals is described. Information about oral language performance and other pertinent information will be presented as necessary.

Chintana

Chintana was a Laotian female identified as non-English proficient by means of the Bilingual Syntax Measure (BSM). At the beginning of the school year she only spoke Lao. Language differences, however, did not interfere with Chintana's attempts to socialize verbally with other children and to make strong efforts to participate in instructional activities such as journal writing.

Over the year, Chintana appeared to make great strides in acquiring knowledge about English print conventions. By May, Chintana drew a caterpillar in her journal and independently labeled it /KTRPLR/. The teacher wrote to Chintana on the journal page the question, /What does the caterpillar turn into?/ (The teacher always wrote comments or questions in the child's presence as she said each word aloud). Chintana responded orally, "Butterfly" and the teacher asked her to write butterfly. Chintana wrote butterfly as /BETRF/. The process leading to this rendition of butterfly included interactions between the teacher and Chintana, and Chintana and other students. Initially, the teacher directed Chintana to identify the beginning sound which Chintana identified as "B". Another student at the writing table then provided the letter "e" and Chintana readily accepted this assistance. The teacher did not intervene about the incorrect information and continued to direct Chintana through the sounds of butterfly until she finished spelling it as /BETRF/. According to Kamii's et al. (1986) classification, Chintana's writing by the month of May was Level III, Consonantal Level.

In June, Chintana drew a kite which she labeled /KIT/. The teacher wrote the question, /Whose kite is it?/ and Chintana responded orally and then in writing: /M KIT/ My kite. While there was a space between the M and the K, intentionality could not be established. The teacher then asked, "Where is your kite?" and Chintana responded orally and then in writing, /FLNTheCK/ Flying in

the sky. This writing sample demonstrated further development, although probably falling short of Kamii's et al. Level IV, Approaching Conventional Spelling.

Chintana's journal writing revealed a progressive awareness of phonemic cues and of English structure similar to that observed in the writings of children who are native English speakers. /FLNTheCK/ is not only a complete sentence but her /The/ indicated the use of visual cues for spelling, another writing strategy employed by native English-speakers. Chintana's writing showed increasing mastery of phonemic, syntactic and semantic forms of English writing.

Michael

Michael was a Hmong male identified as non-English proficient in the BSM. He only spoke Hmong at the beginning of the school year. For more than half the school year, Michael produced no utterances in English. While he would speak to other children in Hmong, he would not attempt to respond in English to the teacher. He also would not converse in Hmong with the school's Hmong aide. However, he seemed to "catch on" quickly concerning what to do in the classroom. During journal writing, he would write in his journal and take his renditions to the teacher for her comments. By December, he began to write letters in his journal: /WOVEIL, LAE/ written sideways. These appeared to be attempts at his name since they were written frequently on his journal and on his Language Experience drawings. It was evident that Michael was attempting to produce written language before expressing English orally, at least in the classroom.

Michael's journal writing up until May fluctuated between Kamii's et al. (1986) Level I, Letter Strings and Level II, Fixed Quantity of Letters in Letter String. For example, in February, Michael wrote labels to different pictures

drawn in his journal, /Ter, PlrrE, IDEr, and BPr/. In April, Michael wrote long strings of letters about his picture that appeared to be a fight between two figures, for example, /HOABPRIRI8Hee8CE/. According to Kamii et al., this writing is at a lower stage than the writing previously discussed. It is possible, that Michael may have been trying to tell a story in writing rather than merely labeling pictures with letters as he had done in the past. He may have been resorting to a known strategy for a new function like telling a story. Of interest is the fact that Michael had begun to speak in English around the time this journal entry occurred.

By June, Michael wrote relevant labels for his pictures such as /PBLI/, elephant, right-to-left, written in approximately one inch high letters and /PB&L/ baby elephant, written in approximately one-fourth inch high letters. He was observed to write /PBLI/ from right to left and /PB&L/ from left to right, a well documented behavior seen in young writers. His varying of the size of the words is consistent with findings of Kamii et al. (1986) that young writers use length of strings to signal length of words and size of letters to signal size of referent.

Michael made substantial progress during the year in all aspects of English acquisition, particularly in oral language. He went from no verbalization to non-stop talking by the end of the year. The following videotape transcript from June, when Michael wrote his rendition of elephant and baby elephant, helps to illustrate.

- Michael: Hi, Hi, teacher.
 T: Hi, Michael.
 Michael: My journal almost finis.
 T: Your journal is almost finished. How many more pages do you have?
 Michael: 2.
 T: 2.
 Michael: I want to draw again.
 T: Okay.

Michael: Teacher I draw. Teacher I finis over here. Embody not finis.
My own finis.
T: Yours is finished?
Michael: Yeah.

...

(Michael writes again.)

Michael: I finis.
T: Write elephant. One elephant went out to...(referring to a poem
they had learned)
Michael: Play.
T: Upon a ...
Michael: Spider web to play.
Michael: Teacher, look it. Look it. I made baby. Baby el-fant.
T: Baby elephant. On. That's good. And where is the baby
elephant at?
Michael: (inaudible)
T: Is he in front of the elephant or behind the elephant?
Michael: Behind the elephant.
T: Very good. You did a good job. Can you write baby elephant?
Michael: Sure!

...

Michael: I finis.
Teacher. Teacher! T! T! (Teacher busy with another child)
Teacher!
T: Michael. That's terrific.
Michael: I want to write again.

...

Michael: Teacher, I write over here down. I write over here. Teacher I
want to write here.
German: Teacher, can I write on another page?
Michael: Yep (to German).

Michael was not only acquiring English semantics (lexicon and concepts) with his "behind the elephant" and "over here" but also the culture-specific, pragmatic aspects of language. His abbreviation of teacher to "T" and his "Sure!" and "Yep" were excellent examples of adapting language to this specific situational context.

Teacher interventions are also noteworthy in this transcript. Some teacher responses which were repetitions in question form of Michael's

utterances provided grammatically correct models for Michael. Also, the teacher used the immediate context for language and concept development. Her reference to a poem learned, her questions about the number of pages left in the journal and about the position of the baby elephant are good examples.

Judy

Judy was a Hmong female identified as limited-English proficient in the BSM. She was predominantly Hmong-speaking at the beginning of the school year. She could perform adequately in English and was often used as an interpreter by the teacher when working with non-English proficient Hmong children.

During journal writing, Judy verbalized substantial knowledge about print. Videotapes showed that she spoke about and consulted the alphabet strip at her place at the writing table while writing her story. In January, she was observed speaking to Michael in English about his journal writing. Michael was copying letters that were upside down. After several viewings of the videotape, to the surprise of the researchers, it became evident that Judy was addressing Michael in English. Using Hmong intonation Judy said to Michael, "It's backwards." Michael looked puzzled and repeated questioningly "Backwards?" Judy went on to say, "Just turn it over," while demonstrating by turning her journal around and pointing in a left-to-right progression. Michael did not seem to understand and proceeded to speak Hmong, switching to a different subject.

In spite of her advantage in oral English and her knowledge of certain print conventions, Judy's journal writing showed little developmental progress over the course of the year as compared to Chintana and Michael. This observation was corroborated by the teacher. Using Kamii's et al. (1986) classification, Judy's journal writing progressed very slowly from Level I to some signs of Level II performance. An explanation for this modest progress

may be that Judy did not yet relate oral language to print although she could verbalize some important print conventions.

In sum, each of these cases exhibited unique progress in their writing performance. The steps through which they progressed resemble those observed in first language writers. The three cases also represent the various personalities and rate of progress found in most classrooms and certainly in the classroom observed. Noteworthy for the study were the various levels of performance in the different English literacies observed. For example, Judy was moderately verbal in general and could speak about print conventions but her writing performance did not seem to match her expressed knowledge. In contrast, Michael, who initially seemed withdrawn, started performing at the beginning stages of writing before uttering any words in English, at least in the classroom. Chintana, differently from both Michael and Judy, was highly verbal from the beginning and demonstrated progress in performance of both oral and written English quickly.

In addition, the role of the teacher as a language mediator to interpret each child's written renditions and provide vocabulary were of interest to the researchers. The strategies used by the teacher consisted of questions, elaborations, repetitions, language modeling, sounding and the like. Such strategies seemed to elicit much of the written and oral renditions observed. (A complete analysis of the teacher's strategies will be forthcoming by Abramson, Seda, & Johnson.

DISCUSSION

The results of this study afford insights concerning the development of English writing of young, linguistically different children. It points to commonalities in literacy development shared with native-English speaking

children. Young, linguistically different learners, who are learning a written language for the first time, demonstrate stages of writing development similar to those of native-speakers as suggested by Ferreiro and Teberosky with Spanish speaking children (1982) and Kamii et al. with English speaking children (1986). This finding has its parallel in the similarities found between oral language acquisition and development in first and second language (McLaughlin, 1984).

In concurrence with numerous recent studies on the literacy development of young children (e.g., Bissex, 1980; Chomsky, 1971; Clay, 1976; Dyson, 1985, 1986; Ferreiro & Teberosky, 1982; Sulzby, 1985, 1986), this study suggests that the relationship between oral and written language is transactional, whether in a first or second language. In addition, the study suggests that learners need not be proficient speakers in the second language to benefit from oral and written transactions in that language. The conclusion is congruent with other recent work in emergent literacy in second language (Edelsky, 1982; Hudleson, 1984). However, it contradicts the traditional wisdom that second language learners must first gain competence in oral language before learning to read and write (Ovando & Collier, 1985).

The results of this study also suggest that individual differences in ability, personality, and style, particularly in approaching a new setting like school, influences literacy learning in a second language. For example, Chintana, who came to school with no English but seemed outgoing and confident from the beginning, made substantial gains in English writing and oral acquisition in a relatively short time. Michael also came to school with no English but, in contrast to Chintana, appeared to be shy, reserved and unwilling to communicate with unfamiliar adults including those who spoke his language. As Michael became more secure, his shyness disappeared. His growing confidence was reinforced by his successful performance on writing and verbal tasks for

which he was given praise and attention from the teacher. While Judy came to school with limited English, was verbal, and seemed comfortable with other children and in the classroom, her progress in writing was modest in comparison to the other two.

All of the children in the classroom varied in the developmental sequence of their emergent English literacy, a finding consistent with Wong Fillmore's research (1982) on second language acquisition. Some children, like Chintana, made strides in all aspects of English literacy from the beginning. Others, like Michael, seemed to need time to begin to show progress in general. Still others, like Judy, showed great progress in some areas (like oral English) and not in others (like writing). This finding is also consistent with Dyson's work (1986) on the writing development of native English-speaking kindergartners. As she contends, "the nature of the individual child, the nature of the situational context, and the complex nature of the writing system itself all interact in written language growth, just as they do in oral language growth" (p. 59).

This study has instructional implications for the linguistically different learner. Interactive journal writing in small, heterogeneous groups seems to be an effective strategy for promoting English literacy development of young children. As applied to journal writing in the linguistically diverse classroom, the term "interactive" is all-inclusive involving both oral and written interactions between teacher and student as well as interactions among students both in English and in their first language. In the kindergarten classroom observed these interactions during journal writing served as mediating events which assisted students in their understanding of concepts and in their writing and verbal performance. Specific interactions also revealed the interrelatedness of oral and written language; learners talked about words, about writing, about reading, and about a literate world in general. It may be

reasonable to suggest that initial literacy instruction in which oral and written language are interrelated is necessary for all learners regardless of their linguistic backgrounds.

Appropriate, well-planned teacher stagings of literacy events such as journal writing seem to be essential. In the classroom observed, the writing center was located in an area of the room where students could verbally interact with the teacher and with other students without being distracted by other activities in the room. The writing table was hexagonal in shape promoting interaction among the group. The writing center was in close physical proximity to charts, books, alphabet strips and the chalkboard. This type of print-rich environment encourages early literacy growth as suggested by Goodman (1986) and Sulzby (1985).

It may be suggested teachers need training in strategies for developing English literacy in second language learners. During the writing activity observed for this study, as well as in other components of the instructional program, the teacher displayed skill in developing English literacy in general. She used repetition and elaboration to expand on children's early utterances in English and to encourage further language development. Students were frequently observed interacting with one another in their first language and the teacher encouraged them to do so. At the beginning of the year, some students would address the teacher in their first language. When this occurred, the teacher, accepted the student's language and tried to establish some level of communication in English. In some instances and when a student, such as Michael, did not verbalize in English, the teacher would involve bilingual students to assist. At times, the teacher was observed to ask students to talk about a picture in their journal in their first language, "so I can learn how to say it." Such practices are consistent with research on programs that result in

positive outcomes for linguistically different students (McLaughlin, 1985). In this latter case, the implicit message to the children that their language is acceptable and appreciated, although there is another language which they need in order to communicate in the school setting.

The commonalities found in this study in the English writing development of native-speaking and linguistically different learners merit further study. More research is also needed on learner characteristics as well as on the instructional strategies conducive to literacy learning in second language learners. Studies in other classrooms and with other age groups are necessary in order to corroborate or falsify the present findings. Of prime importance is to research further the emergent literacy developments of linguistically different learners. Only then would research be able to inform instructional practices for literacy development in a second language.

References

- Amato, R. (1988). Making it happen: Interaction in the second language classroom. White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Beers, J.W. (1980). Developmental strategies of spelling competence in primary school children. In E.H. Henderson & J.W. Beers (Eds.), Developmental and cognitive aspects of learning to spell: A reflection of word knowledge (pp. 36-45). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Bissex, G.L. (1980). GNYS AT WRK: A child learns to write and read. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Calkins, L. (1983). Lessons from a child: On the teaching and learning of writing. Exeter, NH: Heinemann Educational Books.
- Chomsky, C. (1971). Write first, read later. Childhood Education, 47, 296-299.
- Clarke, L.K. (1988). Invented versus traditional spelling in first graders' writings: Effects on learning to spell and read. Research in the Teaching of English, 22, 281-309.
- Clay, M.M. (1976). What did I write? Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Coate, S., & Castle, M. (1989). Integrating LEA and invented spelling in kindergarten. Reading Teacher, 42, 516-519.
- Deford, D. (1986). Classroom contexts for literacy learning. In T.E. Raphael (Ed.), The contexts of school-based literacy (pp. 163-180). New York: Random House.
- DiPardo, A. & Freedman, S.W. (1988). Peer response groups in the writing classroom: Theoretic foundations and new directions. Review of Educational Research, 58, 119-149.
- Dyson, A.H. (1986). Children's early interpretations of writing: Expanding research perspectives. In D.B. Yaden & S. Templeton (Eds.), Metalinguistic awareness and beginning literacy (pp. 201-218). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Dyson, A.H. (1985). Individual differences in emerging writing. In M. Farr (Ed.), Advances in writing research: Vol. 1. Children's early writing development (pp. 59-125). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Edelsky, C. (1986). Writing in a bilingual program: Habia una vez. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Enright, D.S., & McClosky, M.L. (1985). Yes, talking! Organizing the classroom to promote second language acquisition. TESOL Quarterly, 15, 431-453.

- Ferreiro, E., & Teberosky, A. (1982). Literacy before schooling. Exeter, NH: Heinemann.
- Gentry, J.R. (1982). An analysis of developmental spelling in GYNYS AT WRK. The Reading Teacher, 36, 192-200.
- Goodman, Y. (1978). Kidwatching: Observing children in the classroom. In A. Jagger & M. Smith-Burke (Eds.), Observing the language learner (pp. 9-17). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Goodman, Y. (1986). Children coming to know literacy. In W.H. Teale & E. Sulzby (Eds.), Emergent literacy: writing and reading (pp. 1-14). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Graves, D.H. (1983). Writing: Teachers and children at work. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann Educational Books.
- Graves, D.H., & Stuart, V. (1985). Write from the start. New York: E.P. Dutton.
- Harste, J., Woodward, V., & Burke, C. (1984). Language stories and literacy lessons. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann Educational Books.
- Henderson, E.H. (1981). Learning to read and spell: The child's knowledge of words. DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press.
- Hipple, M.L. (1983). Journal writing in kindergarten. Language Arts, 62, 255-261.
- Hoffman, S., & Knipping, N. (1988). Spelling revisited: The child's way. Childhood Education, 64, 284-287.
- Hudleson, S. (1984). Kan yu ret an rayt en ingles: Children become literate in English as a second language. TESOL Quarterly, 18, 221.
- Kamii, C., Long, R., Manning, M., & Manning, G. (1987, April). Spelling in kindergarten: Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Research Association, Washington, DC.
- McLaughlin, B. (1984). Second language acquisition in childhood: Vol. 1. Preschool Children. (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- McLaughlin, B. (1985). Second language acquisition in childhood: Vol. 2. School-age children. (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Ovando, C.J., & Collier, V.P. (1985). Bilingual and ESL classrooms: Teaching in multicultural contexts. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co.
- Peyton, J.K. (1986). Interactive journal writing: Making writing meaningful for language minority students. NABE News, 10(1), 19-21.

- Read, C. (1971). Pre-school children's knowledge of English phonology. Harvard Education Review, 41, 1-34.
- Rogoff, B. (1986). Adult assistance of children's learning. In T.E. Raphael (Ed.), The contexts of school-based literacy (pp. 27-40). New York: Random House.
- Staton, J., Shuy, R.W., Peyton, J.K., & Reed, L. (1988). Dialogue journal communication: Classroom, linguistic and cognitive views. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Sulzby, E. (1985). Kindergartners as writers and readers. In M. Farr (Ed.), Advances in writing research: Vol. 1. Children's early writing development (pp. 127-200). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Sulzby, E. (1986). Writing and reading: Signs of oral and written language organization in the young child. In W.H. Teale & E. Sulzby (Eds.), Emergent literacy: writing and reading (pp. 50-89). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Templeton, S. (1980). What is a word? In E.H. Henderson & J.W. Beers (Eds.), Developmental and cognitive aspects of learning to spell: A reflection of word knowledge (pp. 36-45). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Urzua, C. (1987). "You stopped too soon": Second language children composing and revising. TESOL Quarterly, 21, 279-303.
- Vgotsky, L.S. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner, & E. Souberman (Eds.), Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wong Fillmore, L. (1982). Instructional language as linguistic input: Second language learning in classrooms. In L.C. Wilkinson (Ed.), Communicating in classrooms. New York: Academic Press.